

BEGIN, Menachem

APPROVED FOR RELEASE CIA HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS DIVISION AR 70-14 13NOV2013

V. 5 Jan 78

ISRAEL

FBIS-MEA-7

ISRAEL
N 1

CARTER'S TALKS IN ASWAN WITH AS-SADAT ELICIT REACTION

Begin Comments

TAO41320Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1155 GMT 4 Jan 78 TA

[From the Midday Newsreel]

[Text] The prime minister has already reacted in the Knesset to the meeting between Carter and As-Sadat. Our correspondent Zevi Lidar reports his remarks: [begin recording]

[Begin] About an hour and 15 minutes ago U.S. President Carter called me on a radio-telephone from Air Force 1. We had a very friendly conversation. The President promised to communicate to me the details of his talks in Aswan. In the meantime he told me that President as-Sadat had expressed friendship toward me. Of course, I want to point out that this is a mutual feeling. It is good that we have found a language of mutual and personal understanding since this certainly is an element that can be useful in negotiations.

The negotiations, as you know, will begin on 16 January. Secretary of State Vance will also take part in them. We will certainly hear from Secretary of State Vance and Ambassador Lewis on the details of the talks in Aswan.

[Lidar] The prime minister expressed satisfaction with the fact that As-Sadat's and Carter's announcements did not include the words "Palestinian state."

[Begin] I heard the announcement of President Carter and President as-Sadat. I did not hear the words "Palestinian state," and I noted this as positive, of course. I may be mistaken; President as-Sadat may have used this term. I, however, did not hear it. We listened to the news in Hebrew at 1200 and did not hear this expression. If the two presidents did not use it, I note this as a positive thing.

[Lidar] President Carter asked for flexibility from his friends. Was there room for further flexibility on the part of Israel?

[Begin] Why should there be further flexibility? We have brought a proposal that all those who saw it announced--how do the Sabras say?--that it is "fair" [last word in English]. We will not turn fairness into unfairness. Therefore, we insist on our proposals which are based on fairness.

We will give administrative autonomy in all spheres of life to the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip. We will guarantee real security for the Jews of Eretz Yisra'el. This is fairness, and therefore we will insist on it.

[Question] Mr Begin, President Carter knows this and still he spoke today of flexibility.

[Answer] I have not heard such phrases from President Carter. I want to say that the problem is one of free negotiations between the two countries and--how do the Sabras say it?--a chance should be given to these negotiations, and they should not be burdened and made more difficult by unnecessary questions. [end recording]

V. 5 Jan 78

I 4

NORTH AFRICA

TUNISIA

BOURGUIBA NAMES NEW MEMBERS TO PARTY BODY

LD050240Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 4 Jan 78 ID

[Summary] President Bourguiba this morning received Prime Minister Nouira in the presence of Bourguiba, Jr, special adviser to the president. During the meeting President Bourguiba, in his capacity as chairman of the party, appointed three new members of the Political Bureau of the Destourran Socialist Party. The new members are Mr Abderrahman Ben Messaoud, Iarbi Mallakh and Iarbi Aberrazak. They replace Tabar Belkhoja, Mongi Kooli and Habib Chatti.

NOUIRA WANTS BEGIN TO RESPOND POSITIVELY TO AS-SADAT

LD310005Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 2300 GMT 30 Dec 77 ID

[Excerpts] Prime Minister Hedi Nouira this evening made a statement on French television. Asked what the government's position will be if a strike takes place in the phosphate mines, for example, he replied: I believe there will be no strike in the phosphates mine.

Asked about the rapprochement between Egypt and Israel and the position of a Moslem country like Tunisia toward this rapprochement, Hedi Nouira said: We certainly are Moslems, but why do you want the Moslems to be enemies of the Jews all the time? We must debunk this myth. What is now taking place in the Middle East involves a great deal of courage. It is sufficient to know that the fighting party wants to take the decisive step of securing true, just and correct peace conditions and lasting conditions. So far, it has been President as-Sadat who has taken the first steps. There is nothing to indicate that Prime Minister Begin has responded positively to these moves.

WESTERN SAHARA

POLISARIO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE STATEMENT ISSUED

LD012146Y Algiers Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 1 Jan 78 ID

[Summary] The Executive Committee of the POLISARIO Front met in the liberated lands in the Western Sahara from 26 to 28 December 1977 and issued a statement. It refers to the difficult times through which the Arab world and Africa are passing. The Maghreb is witnessing an escalation of the situation in view of the Moroccan-Mauritanian invasion of the Sahara and the open intervention of France on the side of the forces of aggression. The statement hails the heroic struggle of the Saharan people in defense of its existence. It condemns the maneuvers and plots of the Rabat and Nouakchott regimes aimed at undermining international resolutions and obstructing a just solution to the problem of decolonization in the Western Sahara.

The statement also speaks about widespread dissatisfaction in Morocco and Mauritania with the war effort against the Saharan people. It goes on to praise the front's unilateral decision to free French and Spanish citizens who became prisoners as a result of the war imposed on the Saharan people. France's military intervention threatens the security and aspirations of the peoples of the Mediterranean. The statement then renews its expressions of gratitude to the Algerian people and government for their brave stand of defending the dignity of the Saharan people. It calls on peace-loving peoples in the world to support the just struggle of the Saharan people for self-determination.

ISRAEL

V.. 5 Jan 78

N 8

ISRAEL

Earlier, the local council of Deir Hanna published an advertisement in AL-ANBAH expressing satisfaction with the prime minister's proposals.

Attorney (Jamil Shalhun), a member of the Haifa municipality, made a moving appeal to Begin to personally decide on the matter of the departure of a delegation of Israeli Arabs for Cairo in order to congratulate As-Sadat on his peace initiative.

In his letter (Shalhun) congratulates Menachem Begin and views the autonomy plan proposed by the prime minister for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as a basis for the solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict.

Haifa Residents' Support

TAO41721Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1300 GMT 4 Jan 78 TA

[Text] About 250 Arab residents of Haifa signed a petition supporting Menachem Begin's peace steps. The petition was received today in the office of the prime minister's adviser for Arab affairs. Among those who signed the petition are members of the trustee committee of the waqf in Haifa, notables and rank-and-file people. Similar petitions of support continue to be signed in Galilee villages.

SHAH OF IRAN, BEGIN MAINTAIN CONSTANT CONTACT

TAO21737Y Tel Aviv YEDI'OT AHARONOT in Hebrew 2 Jan 78 pp 1, 8 TA

[By Ilan Kefir, the paper's special representative in Teheran]

[Text] The shah of Iran asked to meet with the Israeli prime minister secretly but the prime minister replied that he could not leave for even a short visit to Teheran. This is what I was told by senior political sources in Iran.

Nevertheless, constant contact has been maintained between the shah and the Israeli prime minister over the last few weeks. According to the Iranian sources, Begin took care to report to the shah about Israel's plans. The shah also receives detailed reports from President as-Sadat about his contacts with Israel.

These Iranian sources reported that in view of Begin's inability to go to Teheran it was concluded in personal talks between the shah's palace and the prime minister's office that a brief secret visit by Foreign Minister Dayan to Teheran would be held. This was indeed carried out last week. Dayan reached Teheran on a special plane that parked beyond the area used for commercial flights. According to the Iranian sources, immediately after landing Dayan was driven to the palace where he met with the shah.

At that meeting Dayan informed the shah of Israel's positive attitude toward Iran's efforts to persuade Jordan to join the talks between Israel and Egypt.

It was also concluded at the meeting that direct contacts between the governments of Israel and Iran will continue in the future.

The Iranians were surprised by the leakage in Israel of information about the meeting. An Iranian source told me: "Such things do not happen here. This harms the security of the state."

V. 5 Jan 78

N 9

ISRAEL

Another Iranian source told me that the possibility of inviting Begin or Dayan to Teheran during Carter's visit there was examined. This was aimed at initiating a meeting between them and King Husayn, but the plan was not carried out.

Yesterday I met with the Iranian information and tourism minister, Dariush Homayun, who told me that "the developments in the Middle East will certainly have a positive bearing on the relations between Iran and Israel. I believe that the relations between Iran and Israel will be different from what they are today."

The minister added: "Iran is aware of the great importance of peace in the Middle East. We will help the best we can in order to promote peace. We are kept informed about the discussions. We keep in contact with the parties involved. We intend to encourage all our friends to aid this process and not be bystanders."

"If peace is achieved in the Middle East, this will be a great relief to all of us. The situation prevailing until now has distressed us all. Since As-Sadat's trip to Jerusalem, however, we have felt a new atmosphere in the region. This atmosphere must not be allowed to die away."

"We expect the Middle East and the entire world to be different once the conflict is ended. This will be a great event for all of us."

DECISION ADOPTED FOR THREE MORE SETTLEMENTS

TA050803Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0500 GMT 5 Jan 78 TA

cat Israel PN9-1P
FBIS-MEA-78-3

[Text] Work on setting up three new settlements and fleshing-out some of the existing settlements in the Rafah approaches will begin within the next few days. A decision on this was made in the Ministerial Committee for Settlement Affairs and was brought to the government's attention in the cabinet meeting held the day before yesterday.

Our correspondent Shim'on Schiffer has learned that the committee adopted two decisions: to put on sale 125 lots in Yamit and to set up 3 Gush Emunim settlements within 10 days. The members of the three Gush Emunim nuclei are presently in the existing Gush Emunim settlements.

Our correspondent says that these decisions are bound to cause disagreement between the Likud and the DMC. The DMC claims that, according to the coalition agreement, decisions regarding settlement to which the DMC is opposed should be submitted to the approval of the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Security Committee.

Eight Villages Started

TA050945Y Jerusalem POST in English 5 Jan 78 p 1 TA

[Text] Al-'Arish--Ground-breaking started today for eight settlements between here and Yamit. Eight bulldozers belonging to Afra, a subsidiary of the Jewish National Fund (JNF), went out, one to each of the settlement sites, and began work simultaneously.

The project is probably part of the Jewish Agency's plans, reported earlier this week, for the extension of Jewish settlements in the Rafah region.

BEGIN, Menachem

APPROVED FOR RELEASE CIA HISTORICAL COLLECTIONS DIVISION AR 70-14 13 NOV 2013

V. 19 Jan 78

BF N 14

ISRAEL

ISRAEL

FBIS-MEA-78-15

This means that this initiative must remain very impressive all the time. This may be obtained in two ways: either by a speedy success, meaning satisfying most of the demands being made by the Arabs since 1967, or by creating an impressive stage in another way, for example, by a dramatic cessation of the talks.

But it is obvious that the peacemaking process between Israel and Egypt will not be able to succeed other than through a difficult, slow and patient effort.

All this does not mean that Israel's leaders have no share in the responsibility for what has happened, such as by the attempt to create faits accomplis in the territories which are the issue of the negotiations.

It is clear that As-Sadat now seeks to push the United States and the Western world into exerting pressure on Israel. It is to be expected that there will indeed be such pressures, or at least a vigorous attempt at persuasion.

However, after Carter described Begin's peace program as a good basis for negotiations and after the debates of the Political Committee achieved progress, it will be hard for the Americans to expect Israel to make a general retreat from its policy.

It is worth adding one more point: What has now happened illustrates the dangers involved in basing the vital interests of a country on the vicissitudes of the moods of a regime ruled by one man.

(Menachem BEGIN)
19 January Begin Speech

TA191237Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1200 GMT 19 Jan 78 TA

[Israeli Prime Minister Begin's speech to functionaries of the United Jewish Appeal from France at Knesset Chagall Hall in Jerusalem--live, in English]

[Text] Honored guests from France: Israel elaborated, reviewed and presented a peace plan in two parts concerning the bilateral relations between our country and Egypt with two principles: 1) demilitarization of the Sinai Dessert, which must not again turn into a staging place for an attack against our country, as has already happened five times within 29 years.

When President as-Sadat visited in Jerusalem, he promised me in a private talk that the Egyptian Army will not again cross the Jiddi and the Mitla passes to the east, and thus the main part of the Sinai Peninsula will be without troops, will be demilitarized. This is a most vital matter for our security. There must be a security belt, which is a lesson from the experience of a generation, in order to avoid the possibility of another war breaking out and in order that we may defend ourselves if we are attacked.

The military experts in Egypt, however, prepared a different map, which does not exactly coincide and it contradicts the private promise given to me by President as-Sadat. In accordance with their plan, the bulk of the Sinai Peninsula would be remilitarized.

We, of course, cannot agree to such a concept, which may prove most dangerous to our future. I repeat: For the sake of peace, for both nations, the Desert of Sinai must be demilitarized. [applause]

V. 19 Jan 78

N 15

ISRAEL

The second principle concerns our settlements in the very narrow strip in the north of Sinai, between Rafai or Rafah and Al-'Arish. This is also one of the most vital issues of our national security. And, of course, there is no government in Israel which would be capable to order dismantling of Jewish settlements in which so much sweat and toil were invested--making the desert blossoming. No land was taken away from anybody. When our settlers came there, it was a complete desert--sand and sand, and nothing else. We brought water from the north, and our men tilled the land, and now it is almost a garden--green, producing. We are not going to destroy the fruit of the labor of our men at the whim of the Egyptian Government.

When I met President as-Sadat at Ismailia, I told him that those settlements are going to stay. Lately, again yesterday, the controlled or directed Egyptian press claimed that at Ismailia I misled President as-Sadat, and therefore, they put on me a new label and they call me "Shylock." Well, I--and lending money. Of course, we will pay attention to the fact that the Egyptian directed press uses an old anti-Semitic expression which wanders throughout Europe since Shakespeare wrote his Merchant of Venice. But did I mislead President as-Sadat? I have no right to quote from the minutes whatever he told me, but I am perfectly entitled to disclose to you what I told him. And now I quote from the minutes of our conversation at Ismailia.

I told the president of Egypt: I have to point out that we cannot leave our settlements and our civilians without self-defense. This is the resolve of our generation, with all the experience behind us. Mr President, we respect your principle and we ask you to respect our principle.

As you can see, at Ismailia I told President as-Sadat not only that the settlements would stay, but they will be defended by an Israeli contingent. This is, in the main, the first part of our peace plan.

The second part relates to the autonomy, administrative autonomy which we suggest to give to our neighbors, the Palestinian Arabs residing in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district.

Ladies and gentlemen, it will be for the first time in history that the Palestinian Arabs residing in those parts of the land of Israel will enjoy self-rule. For centuries they lived under the oppressive Turkish rule; for three decades under the British rule; for 20 years under Jordanian rule, which was very oppressive indeed. The Jordanians ruled the Palestinian Arabs in Judaea and Samaria with a whip. It never occurred to them to suggest self-determination. It never occurred to them to propose autonomy. The same applies to Egyptian rule in the district of Gaza. They ruled the Arabs there directly for 19 years, never gave them Egyptian citizenship, and they let them live in the most horrible, abominable slums for two decades. We take out the people from those slums and give them proper civilized housing and permanent jobs. And so we shall go on doing, in order to solve humanely the problem also of the Arab refugees, who are under our jurisdiction.

For the first time in history comes Israel and suggests to the Palestinian Arabs to enjoy self-rule, autonomy, based on the following principles: They themselves, in a secret ballot, through a democratic election, will elect an 11-member council with 11 departments which will deal with all the problems of daily life. We shall not interfere to any extent whatsoever in the daily life of our neighbors. Security and public order must be the responsibility of the Israeli authorities, because if we should not have control of security, the so-called PLO--that murderous Nazi organization, the baser of which there has never been in history since and except or besides the armed Nazi organizations--would take over Judaea and Samaria in 24 hours.

V. 19 Jan 78

N 16

ISRAEL

Then we would face a mortal danger. Almost all our civilians, men, women and children, would be at their mercy, with their Strelas and Kalachnikovs and Katyushas and heavy guns with the range of 43.8 kms, to be supplied by the Soviet Union in no time--from Odessa to Bethlehem, the flight time between those two sites being only 2 hours. It would turn into a Soviet base, like it happened in Angola and in Mozambique and in Ethiopia. Indeed, when I told President as-Sadat that some of the PLO men are Soviet agents, he corrected me and said: all of them.

Ladies and gentlemen, it would turn into a Soviet base, a mortal danger to us, to the Jewish state. We would then place all our civilians in the Gush Dan [central district], Tel Aviv, Jaffa, Rehovot, Rishon Lezion, Nes Ziyona, Bene Beraq, Ramat Gan, Petah Tiqwa, Giv'atayyim--all those 2.5 million Jews, the remnants of our people, those who were saved from the holocaust--under the range of their conventional artillery, under the control of our most implacable enemy, since the dark days of the Nazis. May I tell you, ladies and gentlemen: Never shall we place our women and children in the range of that implacable enemy of the Jewish people, never! [applause]

But we produced a plan of human decency, autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs, security for the Palestinian Jews. We can live together and build together the country.

Ladies and gentlemen, with this plan in its two parts, I went to Washington a month ago and I presented it to the President of the United States; to the secretary of state; to the ranking senators--Senator Jackson, Senator Case--from both parties, the Democratic and the Republican, represented by them; Senator Javits and Senator Stone; to the former president of the United States, Mr Gerald Ford; to the former secretary of state, Dr Kissinger; to the majority leader of the House of Representatives; to the representative of the mighty Jewish community in the United States--God bless them all, we are proud of the Jewish community in the United States--and then... [applause] May I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that we are also proud of the Jewish community in France. [applause]

Then I went to London and presented the plan to the prime minister of Great Britain and to the foreign secretary of Great Britain. Also Monsieur Francois Poncet saw our peace plan. But until now I didn't get from him any opinion, whereas all those who saw this peace plan said--now I quote: The secretary of state of the United States read out a communique in which he stated: It is a notable contribution; it is a constructive approach. President Carter, our friend, said, having listened to my presentation and seen the maps with all the details, including the question of the Jewish settlements: There is a great deal of flexibility in this plan; it is a long step forward.

Some people say that the Egyptian Government decided yesterday to recall the delegation so that there should be pressure, American pressure, exerted on Israel. Ladies and gentlemen, what pressure? Can a notable contribution become otherwise in 4 weeks? Can a constructive approach become negative in 1 month? Can a great deal of flexibility turn into inflexibility? And can a long step forward be turned into a short step backwards, all in several weeks? It is absolutely inconceivable and not [word indistinct] amongst ourselves, frighten us with this inconceivable concept of pressure to be exerted upon us. We presented a positive plan, a human plan, a decent plan, a real peace plan, far-reaching, sweeping. No pressure can be exerted on us to turn fairness into unfairness, decency into indecency.

V. 19 Jan 78

N 17

ISRAEL

However, during the week, 3 days ago came to us the foreign minister of Egypt--a likeable man. I like him, I told him so. And upon landing on our land, he made a statement at the Ben-Gurion Airport to the effect that we must give up Jerusalem. So he said; he just landed and told us, "you will have to give up Jerusalem."

Jerusalem. May I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, it was the most preposterous statement ever made by a guest. Imagine; I come to France and say that Paris should be divided into two. The very same day I would be asked to leave France. [laughter] But I wouldn't make such a statement. I said it is a preposterous statement for a guest to make, but I have another word, in the language of Corneille and Baudelaire and of Dumas and of Hugo and of Proust. In classical French it means "chutzpa." [laughter and applause]

We didn't ask the foreign minister of Egypt to leave our country after the "chutzpadicke" [Yiddish for impudent] statement. On the contrary, we received him with hospitality and we started negotiations which were quite successful. Out of seven paragraphs of a declaration of principles, we agreed on five. Two were left out, for further negotiations, comme il faut, and suddenly he was recalled. Of course, it was not only our right but our duty to answer that statement, as I did. I would do it at any opportunity.

As prime minister of Israel, it was my duty to explain to the foreign minister of Egypt that Jerusalem, the heart of the Jewish people, was occupied by the Jordanians for 19 years as a result of invasion and aggression, and for 19 years we couldn't go there to pray to the holiest of the holies of the Jewish people. And when we were attacked, 11 years ago, with God's help, our men liberated Jerusalem. Everybody can go now to pray to the holy shrines of his religion: Christians, Moslems and Jews. And so Jerusalem was reunited and it will be united, the capital city of Israel and the Jewish people forever and ever. [applause]

When I met yesterday a group of Egyptian journalists, I started to understand what happened. Amongst the many questions they asked me--not all of them polite, but we played cool--there was the following question: You should recognize the fact, Mr Prime Minister, that President as-Sadat recognized your right to survive. Shalom aleikhem. He recognized our right to survive. Ladies and gentlemen, we never have asked anybody to recognize our right to exist. When Descartes made his famous, famous scientific saying, "cogito, ergo sum,"--I think; therefore, I exist"--he left to us to say, because this is our history: I suffer; therefore, I exist. Credo, ergo sum. But we exist, our dear Egyptian friends, without your recognition, for 3,700 years. Even without the recognition, we left Egypt in order to exist in the land of our forefathers--promised to us by God and man. We never asked your president or your government or any other president or a general or a nation to recognize our right to exist. Who ever asked to recognize the right of France to exist? The right of Belgium to exist? Of Luxembourg to exist? We exist; therefore, we have a right to exist. We paid a price for that right. What a price! Up to this generation. That does not diminish our right to exist; to the contrary.

What we expect from you is to recognize our right to our own land as we recognize your right to 21 sovereign Arab states, stretching from the Persian Gulf up to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, 12 million square kilometers. You should recognize our right to this land we have, the little country, as the expression of the right of national self-determination for the Jewish people, victimized, persecuted, humiliated, ultimately physically destroyed, and at last having come back, back. We expect you to recognize our right to our independence and to our human dignity and to our sovereignty. We never asked you to recognize our right to exist; we have it. The right to exist was given to us by Elohy Avraham, Yizhaq Veya'aqov [the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob]. [applause]

V. 19 Jan 78

N 18

ISRAEL

Well, ladies and gentlemen, the talks within the framework of the Political Committee in Jerusalem were disrupted. We are sorry. We can only say we shall pursue our goal to have peace. We yearn and pray for peace. We produced a good peace plan. We want peace with all our neighbors to the south, with Egypt. We respect the people of Egypt. We tell them if we have peace we can help each other. We do not say so condescendingly. We don't have any superiority complex over the Arabs. We respect the great Arab people and their contribution to human civilization. But neither do we have any inferiority complex. We, too, contributed to human civilization. We can help each other, and we want peace with our northern neighbors and, in the east, we want real peace. We shall pursue this noble goal.

We hope that the talks will be resumed. It is up to Egypt. If the Egyptian Government should, at any day, want to renew, resume the talks, the Government of Israel will be prepared to do so as well. And let nobody despair of the chances of peace--ultimately, ups and downs and crises, walking out and coming back. Ladies and gentlemen, we learned from history, war is evitable; peace is inevitable. [applause]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have a special appeal to make to you. Make an effort today, a unique effort, and it will be earmarked for a great human noble purpose. We have still in this country 45,000 families living in the most abject housing conditions--three, five, seven people in one room. How can the children study? And there are other phenomena of family life under such conditions which, all adults here understand, I do not have to explain. This is depth poverty which is a shame for any society.

We are a Jewish society. We are a people who got the command in the days immemorial--justice, justice, shall ye pursue. Zedeq, Zedeq Tirdof. We cannot acquiesce in this horrible, abominable, intolerable poverty. We want to build for them proper, civilized houses and let the children be happy and smile and study and advance in life. Three hundred thousand people. I made an appeal to the bonds organization, to the Keren Hayesod, to the United Jewish Campaign. Let us all make an effort. The Jewish people in the diaspora and our people in this country, and together we shall solve the problem, in a few years. It cannot be done in a week or a month. We need a few years, but in 3, 4 years, we will make this effort. The flats, the apartments will be built. When you come again, as you will, we shall bring you to those apartments and you will listen to the laughter of a Jewish child.

There cannot be, my friends, a nobler purpose, and therefore I appeal to you: Make an effort. Any amount you give above your contribution last year, or last years, will be earmarked, qodesh [sacred] for this purpose. And if you make the effort and we shall match it here, in a few years we shall solve completely this economic, social--no--moral problem. And you will be happy in sharing of this human solution. So, today, I appeal to you: Make an effort, a special effort, a great one and you will have great naches [Yiddish for joy] when the day comes and those families are happy in their apartments.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, let us stand together. We may face difficult times. I tell you in French, [words in French indistinct] strong and calm, we shall stand. Ours is a good cause, a just cause. We hate war, we hate bloodshed. We want peace. We made a step forward, a long step forward. It will come. Let us stand together, Jews all over the world, with the Jews in Eretz Yisra'el. Let us stand together and make this land of ours strong, unconquerable, its people and its army invincible, and make sure that Israel and her children and children's children will live in security, in peace, in liberty, in justice, from generation to generation, forever. [applause]

V. 20 Jan 78

N 6

ISRAEL

FBIS - MEA - 78-14

HA'AREZ believes the time is not yet ripe for a three-way summit meeting. Furthermore, the prime minister should keep in mind that after the summit there is no place to which to appeal the decisions that will be adopted at the summit. The paper takes exception to Begin's eagerness yesterday morning, when he expressed willingness to accept President Carter's invitation to meet in Washington with Anwar as-Sadat. Israel's prime minister had better not hasten to Washington. If As-Sadat is interested in resuming the talks with us, there is no need to involve the U.S. President in cautious preparation of the ground for resuming the direct contacts between Jerusalem and Cairo.

The Jerusalem POST says that if, following the dissemination between Egypt and Israel, President as-Sadat's purpose is the recruitment of the United States in a campaign to impose a solution on Israel, then the peace effort will have been seriously ruptured.

NAZOFE calls on everyone to react to recent events with patience and restraint, but to stand firmly by principles. The initiative must not be left to the Egyptian president. Instead of defending ourselves against President as-Sadat's accusations, we had better explain persuasively to public opinion in the world, and especially in the United States, what price Israel is offering in return for a real peace treaty.

'AL HAMISHMAR says a maximum effort is needed now to save the talks. Naturally, we are unable to receive Egypt's ultimatum positions. Israel's contribution, however, must find expression in a declaration about the right of the Palestinian people to express their national entity in a Jordanian-Palestinian political framework, which is the lesson we should draw from what has occurred.

HAMODIA writes that the government acted wisely when it delayed for further consideration the suggestion to continue at once the Military Committee discussions. Thus the government made President as-Sadat understand that it is not for him exclusively to decide on the process of the talks. If the government agreed to attend the Military Committee, this would have been interpreted as offering the other cheek after President as-Sadat's slap in the face.

SHE'ARIM says all forces of the nation should be united and a policy begun of struggle for Israel's right to defensible borders and to prevent the danger of the formation of a Palestinian state. Almost the entire nation is united on this point and we must jointly struggle for our security and for our future.

NASHA STRANA thinks that if and when the discussions and the negotiations are resumed, Israel will have to demand that Israeli military installations remain intact. The installations will be a real guarantee that what is said today will not be changed tomorrow.

(Menachem B. Begin) 17 Jan Banquet Speech PNL-8

TA200920Y Tel Aviv Government Press Office in English 18 Jan 78 TA

[Transcript of speech by Prime Minister Begin at banquet for Egyptian and U.S. delegations at Jerusalem Hilton Hotel on 17 January]

[Text] The Secretary of State of the United States, our gracious lady, Mrs Vance, His Excellency the Foreign Minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Our Own Excellency our Foreign Minister and our gracious lady, Mrs Dayan, my wife--no titles--my honoured guests, members of the American delegation; my honoured guests, members of the Egyptian delegation; my colleagues, members of the cabinet; my parliamentary colleagues, members of the Congress, of the House of Representatives; my parliamentary colleagues, members of the Knesset and President of the Supreme Court; His Honour the Mayor of Jerusalem, "Aharon Aharon Haviv"; (last but not least) the leader of the opposition; ladies and gentlemen.

V. 20 Jan 78

N 8

ISRAEL

The Egyptian foreign minister is a young man, but the foreign secretary and I belong to the same generation--excuse me--and our generation, Mr Secretary, remembers that wonderful concept of self-determination was misused in the '30s. In the late '30s as the result of the misuse of that concept disaster was brought on Europe, upon the world, which extricated itself from their disaster almost miraculously. And therefore out of deep respect for the great Arab people and rejoicing and not begrudging their right of self-determination, may I state that never again (will) that concept be misused because we'll remember the '30s, the late '30s and the result of that misuse.

Mr Foreign Minister, when you go back home soon--and then come back soon, we would like your presence in Jerusalem ('Ezer [Weizman] likes his presence in Cairo from time to time)--convey to the president our respect and our friendship. You should know that the people of Israel, our democratic parliament which you saw today, in action, and the government have deep respect and friendship for your president, and appreciate his decision, his historic decision to come to Jerusalem. We of course received him as I promised in my letter to him, with respect and cordiality and he felt it. All members of the Egyptian delegation who followed and accompanied President as-Sadat will bear me out that the reception was respectful and cordial as befits that hospitality which both peoples inherited from our common father, old Abraham. So convey this message of respect, friendship and good will.

Mr Secretary, we meet quite often, either in Jerusalem or in Washington. May I express our gratitude to you and to Ambassador Lewis for your contribution to have an agreed-upon agenda for the two foreign ministers of Egypt and Israel. The French call an agenda "ordre de jour," which in English translation means the order of the day, but in order to have an agreed order of the day, we lost a night. We spoke on the phone with Sam [U.S. Ambassador Samuel Lewis] since 2:30 in the morning and little sleep we had that night but it was worthwhile. We thank you for the American contribution to that initial agreement which is very important, and please, Mr Secretary, convey to the great friend of Egypt and of Israel our thanks.

Now ladies and gentlemen, this is an evening of friendship, of understanding, of goodwill. May I say it is no secret that we have differences of opinion. We have, as any one of you who studies history [knows], we do know that all negotiations to establish peace and to sign peace treaties after war started from differences of opinion. Ultimately an agreement was reached and peace was established. So I do believe this is going to be the case with the Egyptian-Israeli negotiations.

Ladies and gentlemen, I raise my glass to peace between the great Arab people and the State of Israel, to cooperation between the great Egyptian people and the people of Israel, to the traditional lasting, everlasting friendship between the United States and the State of Israel--and with God's help we shall leave the blessings of peace to our children and children's children.

DPA: MILITARY DELEGATION WILL NOT GO TO CAIRO

NC191801Y Cairo DPA in Arabic 1735 GMT 19 Jan 78 NC

[Text] Jerusalem, 19 January--Sources of the Jerusalem government today affirmed that the Israeli delegation to the discussions of the Egyptian-Israeli Military Committee will not go to the Egyptian capital at this time.

V. 24 Jan 78

BK
BB

ISRAEL

ISRAEL

N 1

BEGIN ADDRESSES KNESSET ON PEACE TALKS WITH EGYPT

FBIS-MEA-78-16

TA231604Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1404 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Address by Prime Minister (Menachem Begin) at the start of a political debate on Mideast developments in the Knesset on 23 January--live]

[Text] Mr Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Knesset: Mr Speaker, please permit me to congratulate the Israeli parliament on its 29th birthday. I am one of the three or four members sitting in the house today who can remember the day that saw the start of democracy in Israel. We went to the elections 29 years ago, and we elected the founding assembly. Those were days of war and bloodshed, and despite this, we fulfilled the duty to hold a free vote and election. We came together in the founding assembly and we were joyful, for only a few months earlier we had liberated ourselves from slavery and raised our flag among the flags of the nations. We declared our national independence. On the day of the Knesset elections we declared our civil independence. I remember that great day and since then, for a whole generation, this free house has existed.

From my experience in the world this is one of the best parliaments in democratic countries. Ordinary days and great ones, calm and stormy days, sometimes difficult disputes, good friendship after the disputes--a democratic parliament par excellence. We are blessed to have such a house, and on the birthday of the parliament, I wish for it, Mr Speaker, and all Knesset members that the house continue to decide on matters of the nation, to serve as an example of freedom, freedom of speech and mutual respect for peoples near and far.

Mr Speaker, on 27 Heshvan, 8 November 1977, President as-Sadat faced the People's Assembly in Egypt and expressed a willingness to come to Jerusalem and appear before the Knesset. In that speech President as-Sadat said that he demanded two conditions from Israel: withdrawal to the lines prior to the 6-day war and the establishment of a state called Palestine. On the next day I reacted to this sudden announcement from the Egyptian president and I issued the following statement: I wish to mention that upon taking office I announced that I am prepared to meet with the Egyptian president in any place, including Cairo, in order to negotiate for the establishment of a real peace in the Middle East. Israel rejects, totally and outright, President as-Sadat's conditions of the establishment of a country called Palestine. These conditions endanger the very existence of the State of Israel. However, President as-Sadat can bring this position to the Geneva conference, just as we will bring our positions to it. Let no party make its positions a precondition to participation in the peace conference. If this is not rhetoric and President as-Sadat is really prepared to come to Jerusalem, to the Knesset, we welcome this willingness.

After several additional exchanges over 9 days and the sending of a written invitation from me to President as-Sadat, he came to Jerusalem, appeared before the Knesset and paid the important visit by a president of a state which is still in a state of war with Israel. In other words, when President as-Sadat decided to visit Eretz Yisrael and to appeal to the Knesset and through it to our people--in fact, to several peoples in various parts of the world--he well knew what we were prepared to accept and what we were not prepared to accept under any condition.

We met in Jerusalem. During the lengthy talk at night between President as-Sadat and myself in the King David Hotel, the president told me that with respect to Sinai he promised me that the Egyptian Army would not cross the Mitla and Gidi passes.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 2

ISRAEL

To this day there has been no denial of this presidential statement. On the contrary, when we met in Ismailia I repeated the president's remarks and submitted them in writing for his inspection. There was total silence on the other side.

Members of the government, the deputy prime minister, the foreign minister, the defense minister, the minister of agriculture and the finance minister heard from me on that same night about President as-Sadat's statement to me, and on the basis of that statement we built our peace plan with respect to the Sinai Peninsula. The distance between the Gidi and Mitla line and the international border--between Eretz Yisra'el and Sinai--is between 180 and 200 km. However, when General al-Jamasi submitted to Defense Minister 'Ezer Weizman the demilitarization and disengagement line Egypt proposes to us upon the signing of a peace treaty, it transpired that the Egyptian line was only 40 km. Mr Speaker, I must point out that for us this difference is the difference between two worlds. No appeal, no rhetoric, however sublime, can change the fact that the Sinai Desert has been a base for aggression against Israel 5 times in 30 years. Nothing is holy about a base for aggression. On the contrary.

Therefore, we stated that in any peace treaty between Israel and Egypt the Sinai Desert would be demilitarized. I said explicitly this to President as-Sadat. We can no longer agree that this desert again be full of soldiers, and the President made me his promise, as I have informed you.

Mr Speaker, I remember the discussion at Yalta about the future of Poland. There was a brisk discussion between the Russians on one side and the Americans and British on the other. The Russians persuaded the U.S. President that Poland was an open corridor for aggression by Germany against the Soviet Union--or against Russia--twice in one generation, and on several other occasions in the past, and we have to close this corridor. This was said by the spokesman of the Soviet Union at that time. They were not talking about a barren desert but a breathing nation and a great people. However, the view was adopted. No country should be allowed to become a base for aggression.

We have fought in the Sinai Desert five times because Egypt attacked this small people, and especially in 1948, the day after the declaration of our independence, when we had few arms, when our sons did not have the wherewithall to defend this small nation when it faced the danger of physical extermination by armies approaching its heart in the south, north and east. In 1948 the Egyptian Army was only 20 km from Tel Aviv, Mr Speaker. I met up with it in Zarnuqa. It was next to Ramat Rahel at the southern entrance of Jerusalem, the capital, and other armies fought along with it, and we were at the brink of the abyss. All this happened because the Sinai Desert was what the French call a place d'armes--a base for aggression. We will no longer, under any conditions, agree that in a peace treaty there will be a possibility for the Sinai Desert to be a base for aggression.

Therefore, from this podium I appeal to President as-Sadat to instruct the Egyptian General Staff to submit a proposal to us for the demilitarization of Sinai in accordance with his promise. His word should be credible in the relations between Egypt and Israel, and there should be no disavowal by the Egyptian General Staff of the Egyptian president's promise. In the peace treaty between us and Egypt, there will not be even one Egyptian soldier farther forward than the Gidi and Mitla line, and the whole area will be demilitarized and will insure peace for both Israel and Egypt.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 3

ISRAEL

On the basis of this promise the Israeli delegation, consisting of the foreign minister, the defense minister and myself, together with our advisers and aides, left for Ismailia. At the Ismailia conference we agreed--in private talk between President as-Sadat and myself--to set up two committees to continue the negotiations between our countries--a Military Committee, which would sit in Cairo under the alternate chairmanship of the ministers of defense, and a Political Committee, to sit in Jerusalem, alternately chaired by the foreign ministers. This was an important agreement.

After it was formulated I proposed to President as-Sadat that we issue a statement on behalf of the two countries, and this is what it said: [begin English] Following the historic events in the Middle East the visit of President as-Sadat to Jerusalem and the reception accorded to him by the people, the parliament and the Government of Israel, the governments of Egypt and of Israel are determined to continue their effort to reach a comprehensive peace settlement in the region. As part of such a settlement, they will negotiate peace treaties on the basis of the principles envisaged in Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338--withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the conflict of June 1967, determination of secure and recognized boundaries within which all nations in the Middle East will live in peace, free from threats or acts of force. The Palestinian Arabs, residents of Judeaea, Samaria and the Gaza district, will enjoy self-rule. [end English]

When President as-Sadat heard our proposal he said positive things about it. However, on my initiative, after he made an important observation to me--I never had the intention of ignoring it--I proposed to him that his advisers prepare a counterproposal so that we could discuss both of them and try to reach a joint and agreed proposal. President as-Sadat's advisers submitted a proposal to us. We discussed it. The Egyptian draft included two clauses, among others: First, Israel will undertake to withdraw from Sinai, from Golan, from Judeaea, from Samaria and from Gaza; second, Israel will agree to self-determination for the Palestinian people. This was written in the original draft. We informed President as-Sadat and his advisers that these two clauses were unacceptable to us. As for withdrawal, nothing in 242 obliges us to withdraw to the lines of 4 June 1967, and we explained to President as-Sadat that in the original proposal for 242 it was said [begin English] Withdrawal from all the territories [end English]. During the negotiations it was agreed to delete the word [next word in English] all, and the words [next two words in English] the territories remained. After further negotiations it was agreed by all, including the Soviet Union and the Arab countries, that the word [next word in English] the [would be deleted], and, in accordance with the well-known interpretation, the words [next two words in English] from territories remained. This does have significance if there are such prior proposals which, in both versions--and certainly in the first of them--pointed to the obligation of withdrawal from all the territories, and between a version in which these two words are removed, despite the fact that they were proposed. This means that Israel is not obliged to sign such an undertaking, and it will not sign one.

As for the term, self-determination [indistinct interjection by MK Tawfiq Toubi]. Mr Tawfiq Toubi, we have been in this house together for 29 years. Perhaps you could make a more serious contribution to the debate than an interjection. You have made your contribution and I will answer. You will not be able to disturb me. As for the term self-determination we explained to President as-Sadat that we do not want anything latent which could become a Palestinian state.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 4

ISRAEL

Of course, great and beautiful words can be put to bad use, and, on another occasion, I proved that this was the case with respect to the Wilsonian term of the right of national self-determination for peoples during the thirties. The misuse of this resulted in a tragedy, first for central Europe, then for Western Europe, then for Eastern Europe and then for the entire world. Therefore, we cannot accept this proposal. After a discussion between the two delegations, the formula for a joint announcement or declaration was agreed upon not containing these two terms.

Gentlemen, members of the Knesset, I will read to you the draft of the declarations, whose contents were totally agreed on by both the Israeli and Egyptian delegations at Ismailia. After a preamble, [begin English] the governments of the Arab Republic of Egypt and Israel are determined to continue their effort to reach a comprehensive peace settlement in the region. Two, within the framework of such a settlement, they express their willingness to negotiate peace treaties on the basis of the principles envisaged in the Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Three, the two sides agree that the establishment of a just, a lasting peace requires the fulfillment of the following: to act in accordance with Resolution 242: A) withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the 1967 conflict; B) termination of all claims of states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty and territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force; C) guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; D) achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem; and E) guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones. [end English]

As I said, this was the joint declaration of principles of both delegations, and it was endorsed by both. What was not agreed on? There was an Egyptian proposal with respect to the Arabs of Eretz Yisrael, whose contents I have already read, and there was an Israeli proposal, which I have also read to you. There was a discussion. We did not achieve a joint draft. After we postponed the continuation of the meeting until the next day, we, the Israeli delegation, submitted a proposal to President as-Sadat and his colleagues that each party determine its position--both with respect to substance and with respect to language--and, therefore, we agreed: [begin English] The Egyptian position is that in the West Bank and Gaza a Palestinian state should be established. The Israeli position is that in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district the Palestinian Arabs should enjoy self-rule. [end English] President as-Sadat read both of these drafts at the joint press conference in Ismailia.

After further deliberations, members of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry said that since no agreed and joint formula had been reached--acceptable to the Israeli and Egyptian delegations--with respect to the issue of the Arabs of Eretz Yisrael in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza--or as they say, and it is their right to say, in the West Bank and in Gaza--we cannot agree to the issuing of the joint declaration of principles, and for this reason this declaration was not issued. However, I must stress, Mr Speaker, that both delegations in Ismailia achieved total agreement about the declaration of principles in accordance with the English draft that I have read to you.

After the Ismailia conference, Mr Speaker, and until the convening of the Military Committee in Cairo and the Political Committee in Jerusalem, remarks were made public in Egypt. In the newspaper AL-AKHBAR a journalist famous in Egypt, Mustafa Amin, published an article headlined: "The Meeting Did Not Take Place With a Representative of the State of Israel But With Shylock."

V. 24 Jan 78

N 5

ISRAEL

And in the article I found the following sentences: This meeting was not a meeting with representatives of the State of Israel but a meeting with Shylock--the arms dealer in Shakespeare's famous story about the Jewish usurer who wanted to cut a pound of flesh from the face of the debtor as payment of his debt. [Interjection by MK Zayyad: Mustafa Amin was tried as an American agent in Egypt.] You tell him that. [Interjection by MK Zayyad: He does not represent the feelings of the Arab people or of the Egyptian people.] That is a compliment that you should give to him. Am I to judge whose agent he is? I am not even saying whose agent you are. [laughter] So, Mr Speaker, this famous journalist maintains that Shylock wanted to cut flesh from the face of the debtor. Sometimes, when a journalist writes something inaccurate I ask him: Do you read? And he answers me: Why should I read, I write.

Every child knows that the demand was not for flesh from the face but from another part of the body. However, let's turn a blind eye to this ignorance. Still, we do remember that since Shakespeare wrote "The Merchant of Venice" the term Shylock has been used by all haters of the Jewish people in the past 300 years, intentionally. This is the way that the Jer has been depicted. Here is Shylock. They did not even read. They do not know what happened to that Jew--whose beloved daughter was taken from him, and he cried to the heavens: Restore my daughter to me. And no one answers. However, Shylock, the man who insisted on a pound of flesh from the chest, Mr Mustafa, not from the face, Shylock. [as heard]

Negotiations for a peace treaty are being conducted between us. President as-Sadat visited the Knesset, stood on the podium upon which I am standing now and said that he was coming here in order to overthrow all the barriers of preconceptions between us. At the height of the negotiations one of his aides--whom President as-Sadat released from prison and allowed to edit this magazine and the semiofficial newspaper AL-AHRAM--calls a Jew by the name of Shylock. In this way all the barriers were recreated. From the land of the Nile we can hear the famous voice, which we have heard in all the countries, of our humiliation and oppression. However, today we are in our own land and country. And this learned man, Mustafa Amin, goes on: We went to invite them to live and they came to invite us to commit suicide. Members of the Knesset, you have heard all the details of our peace plan. Did this peace plan call upon the Egyptians to commit suicide? So here you see the imaginary talk which has no foundation in reality, and it has only one purpose--to make this people hated by the Egyptian people. And this journalist goes on: The Egyptians were stunned when they heard President Carter's statements when he announced that he opposed the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. It appears that Carter, writes the Egyptian journalist, insists on continuing his international dance in which he takes two steps forward and then one step back. If his latest statement has proved that he has changed his dance--and he is now making one step forward and two steps back--we do not know if this is the fault of the U.S. President or the fault of the orchestra to whose music he is dancing. These are the defamatory remarks about the U.S. President, just because he said that the establishment of a state that would endanger the existence of the State of Israel and other free nations was inconceivable.

On 3 January 1978 in the semiofficial and perhaps totally official newspaper AL-AHRAM, an article by Mr Anis Mansur, where, among other things, he says: Drinking coffee together proves nothing. One can also drink coffee in a zoo, and even a man on death row gets a cup of coffee. After this zoological description, he continues: We know that to sit with Jews is to sit with the usurers of the world throughout the generations.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 6

ISRAEL

We have heard this language, both in our generation and in generations past. The Jews are the usurers of all generations. And then he goes on: The Jews, as is their custom, doubt everything. Even if the angel of death appears before them, they will bargain for every minute. He continues: There is a joke--what a joke--that tells of a Jew who went to the pope during the Middle Ages and asked him to sell hell. The pope laughed at the Jew who wanted to make a deal which had not profit, but the Jew turned around to the good Christians and asked them: How much will you pay in order not to enter hell? What a joke! All this is taking place during the very days that negotiations for a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel are underway.

In AL-AKHBAR on 1 January 1978 there is an article which says: We must not forget that the Israelis are Israelis and that bargaining, the weaving of ploys and profit and loss considerations are part of their character and they are unable to change themselves. They are well known and we have heard them for many generations.

On 2 January an article appeared in AL-AKHBAR which said: Superiority and the right to rule the whole world as written in their holy book [presumably Hitler's "Mein Kampf"] is the dream, aspiration and line of thought of Zionism and also of Hitlerism and Nazism. This is a new version of the protocols of the elders of Zion.

There is more, but that is enough. On 11 January an article appears in AL-AHRAM containing the following passage: [Name indistinct] stresses that Begin is wrong if he believes that the Arabs will split up and that therefore he will be able to impose peace by force of arms or even by hinting about this force. Here is a quote: The Arabs can be united by another October, in all senses of the term--solidarity in war, in oil and in Arab capital. At the height of negotiations we have a threat of war--October. Members of the Knesset, we have to know that to this day the masses in Egypt are convinced that we were beaten and that they won the Yom Kippur war. We know that this is nothing but a fairytale, one of many. However, they are convinced of this. Well, we are conducting negotiations as civilized people, as equals, and then comes a threat that if we do not accept their demands we will have an October, in accordance with the Egyptian interpretation, and all those countries which participated in the October war will again attack us. A threat of war.

Later on, Mr Speaker, on 14 January, President as-Sadat's interview in the magazine called OCTOBER was published. I have the entire interview in my hands. I have read it more than once. Let me tell you--and this is a personal note--I read it and I was stunned. I asked myself: Is this the same man, Anwar as-Sadat, who came to us, spoke with us, chatted with me until 0300, and at the conclusion of the conversation he said to me: [next four words in English] You are my friend? Is this the same man who, a week earlier gave an interview to the OCTOBER magazine, which was a pleasure to read? What change occurred? Perhaps there have been two changes, because the man who told the editor of OCTOBER what I am about to read is a different man. He says, for example, that we, in the peace plan that we submitted to him are behaving in accordance with the saying--and this is how it is put here--I hope you go to sleep so that I can kill you. Our peace plan. This means that we are telling the Egyptian people, go to sleep and then while you are sleeping we will come and kill you. This is the significance of the Israeli peace plan.

The interviewer poses the following question to Anwar as-Sadat: Do you not believe that what Begin and Peres recently said after your speech in the Knesset and the remarks that both have reiterated are really a party maneuver, with each helping the other to adopt a better position from Israel's point of view?

V. 24 Jan 78

N 7

ISRAEL

See, the interviewer is observing the Jewish people: There is Shim'on Peres and here am I. We have differences of opinion. He is in the opposition, thank God. I am serving in this office and we have a conspiracy going together, that we are playacting. The dispute between us is not real, and we are trying to deceive the Egyptian people. Anwar as-Sadat answers this question as follows: I know that. It appears, however, that Shim'on Peres, Golda Meir and others in the opposition have used a stranger method. They accuse Begin of ignoring the rights of the Israeli people and of giving more than he should, despite the fact that Begin has given nothing. More. As-Sadat says that the Israelis want to transfer to us part of the fear that they experience. President as-Sadat appeared here, spoke to the Knesset and met with this public and came to the conclusion that the people sitting in this house are full of fear. Furthermore, in their strange way they are trying to pass their fear on to others. These are the examples that I bring you, and they contain words of hate and loathing.

Now our friends from across the canal tell us that they, too, are Semites, and, therefore, it is not fitting to use the term anti-Semitism. This is true, certainly from a historical point of view, and President as-Sadat rightly told us in Ismailia: We are cousins. Certainly. But this term, anti-Semitism, that we are using, this is a European term. The word was coined in Germany, ladies and gentlemen, so as not to say anti-Jewish--and since that time everyone knows what this word means. This disgrace among nations, suddenly, at the height of the negotiations, after Israel has displayed good will, had prepared a peace plan which was not rejected by any of those who saw it, consisting of two parts--and I will not quote what Mr as-Sadat told me about this plan, about both parts of it.

So here you see that this ugliness which we have known for generations suddenly raises its head in the land of the Nile, and we see anti-Semitic remarks, aimed at humiliation, throughout the 12 days between the Ismailia conference--which ended with friendship and understanding, with a promise that we would conduct negotiations as equals, with the establishment of two committees to conduct the negotiations--and the convening of the committee in Jerusalem.

Two days ago President as-Sadat made a speech to the Egyptian People's Assembly. Among other things, he said the following: We have heard official Israeli declarations that negotiations should last for 5 years. You, gentlemen, are witnesses that no one in Israel has claimed that the negotiations should last for 5 years. We proposed a few months, which is certainly required. Details have to be dealt with and details are very important. Some call this bargaining--the Jews are bargaining. What do they have to bargain about? They should do as we say because I, the Egyptian president, visited Jerusalem. What are they bargaining about? It is hard to understand. It is impossible to understand. However, when did we say that the negotiations should last for 5 full years, and the whole house is witness to this.

Moreover, they wanted to turn this issue into a national issue inside Israel and with respect to the Israeli people--to take advantage of the psychological structure of this people, who emigrated to the land of Palestine and eked out an existence year after year by establishing these settlements until they became a basis for determining their continued stay and existence. Mr Speaker, this is the history of Zionism. We imposed ourselves on the land of Palestine, and I want to repeat, with all due respect to President as-Sadat, this was not so.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 8

ISRAEL

We returned to Eretz Yisra'el. We did not dispossess anyone of his land. We returned to our land by right and we had to build it. That is true. We had to make its barrenness fertile, as is written. By right we returned to it and built it, and we have fought for it. This is the real history of Zionism--the liberation movement of the people of Israel, and not as you spoke about it to the members of the Egyptian People's Assembly.

President as-Sadat also said, with respect to what is called the incident at the Hilton Hotel banquet, that I apologized for the remarks I made that evening. Mr Speaker, there is no shame in apologizing. I am sure that if a man makes a mistake he should apologize. On the contrary, such an apology brings him honor. However, the truth of the matter is that I did not apologize because I had nothing to apologize for. The Egyptian foreign minister was here at the Knesset. I received him kindly, as is usual in Israel. However, I (?warned) him about all these anti-Semitic quotes. The truth of the matter is that he apologized to me--especially about the term Shylock--and he told me that when he faced the tribunal in 1946 a famous Jewish Egyptian lawyer defended him and to this day he is grateful to this Jewish lawyer. That is very nice, and then, in a friendly conversation we agreed that both sides should avoid making inciting statements that could ruin the atmosphere, because the truth of the matter is that for 10 days we turned a blind eye--the members of the Knesset will remember--we did not react to the Shylock, we avoided entering a dispute with President as-Sadat over his second interview to OCTOBER magazine. However, when the Egyptian foreign minister came to us knowing full well what was written--I must point out that he informed me that he had not read the Shylock article and I believe him--but I (?warned) him about this, and we both agreed that in the future we would avoid making inciting remarks. I had no intention of promising him that I would not make a political speech during the banquet because this is the custom of the world. I will give you some examples from my experience.

I went to the United States and on the White House lawn I was received with honor and friendship by the U.S. President, but he immediately said that there were differences of opinion between us. This was an important political statement and I answered it. The U.S. President had an absolute right to say what he said and I had the right to answer and one should not panic about this. I went to Romania in August. The prime minister of that land received me with a speech at a banquet in a beautiful hall, and he told me of the political path that Romania believed in and I was not offended but I answered him. He had the right to have his say, and I had the right and duty to answer and no one was offended. I went to London. There were two banquets--one given by British Prime Minister Mr Callaghan in my honor, and the other I gave for him--and at both banquets the two of us made political speeches. This is the custom of the world.

And what did I say during that banquet? It should be remembered that the Egyptian foreign minister arrived here, landed at Lod airport--was met by our foreign minister--who had friendly remarks to make--and he immediately said, or read, that Israel should withdraw to the lines of 4 June 1967 and return, as he put it, old Jerusalem. On the following day, again in the wake of a positive and hospitable speech from the foreign minister, the Egyptian foreign minister said that we had to return Jerusalem. It was my national duty, Mr Speaker, at the customary opportunity which I had, to react to these remarks, and I explained to him and to all assembled that Jerusalem cannot be divided and that we will not withdraw to the lines of 4 June 1967 and that we will not allow the misuse of the great words the right of national self-defense. He could have responded. I did not apologize. I had nothing to apologize about and no agreement was violated, but, on the contrary, it was carried out. [as heard] Nevertheless, this is what President as-Sadat said to the Egyptian People's Assembly.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 9

ISRAEL

He also claimed that my remark that we had never asked either Egypt or any other people to recognize our right to exist was arrogance. Members of the Knesset, I will give you the entire stenographic record of the exchanges between the Egyptian journalists with whom I spoke and myself in the language in which they were said. Well, the Egyptian journalist--never mind his name--says to me: [begin English] We accept the right of Israel to survive. [end English] And I answered: [begin English] Thank you for this question. My dear friend, there is some miscomprehension on this issue. Probably you got so used to hostility toward Israel for the last 3 decades that you see as a great change the fact that you are kind enough to recognize our right to exist or to survive. We have never asked you to recognize this right. My dear friends, every nation has a right to exist. You know why? Because it exists and we got our right to exist from the same God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, whom you worship as we do. [end English] And further on: [begin English] Thank you, my friend. We have never asked for such recognition. We don't need it. We have the same right to exist as the British and the French and the Americans and the Russians and the Egyptians and the Syrians. [end English] I repeated these remarks to the delegation of the United Jewish Appeal from France and I stand by them.

I want President as-Sadat to hear my remarks. We are not asking, neither from the Egyptian president nor from the president of any other country, far or near, large or small, recognition of our right to exist. We have such a right and it is not in doubt. What we did ask and what we will insist on is the recognition of our right to our land and to our sovereignty over it and our right to peace and to a peace treaty. We also did this to the president. However, to my regret, we had to repeat it.

Mr Speaker, at the end of his remarks, President as-Sadat says, while mentioning his speech to the Knesset: I did not come to ask you to withdraw totally from the conquered Arab land which was conquered after [as heard] 1967--the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan and Sinai--it is obvious that we are not prepared to argue about this. No, Mr President, with all due respect, it is not obvious, it is not understandable. It is not acceptable. We have not and we will not give you or any other leader such a commitment. We must not. We will not lead you or anyone else astray, and we informed you of this position while you were here in Jerusalem and after you left this podium.

The 6-day war was a war of defense, and for this reason two rights arise from it. First, without a peace treaty the armed forces will remain in the places where they were positioned on the day of the cease-fire, or in accordance with mutual and signed agreements--and I ask the Egyptian president and the Arab leaders around us to take note that without a peace treaty no Israeli soldier will move from his guard post. Any change will be agreed upon and the change will be inscribed, written and signed in the peace treaty and nowhere else. Secondly, it is well known that in the wake of a war of defense territorial changes take place. They are legitimate in accordance with international law and practice as we saw in Europe after the two wars--after every war. These changes are a question of a peace treaty. Not by force, only by right--also the right of a peace treaty. Such a right does exist and we will insist on it.

[Interjection by MK Wilner of Hadash] There is no right to exterminate the Palestinian people, as your plan proposes. Who was the aggressor? There are differing opinions about this. I have already told you that you want to exterminate us. [as heard] I want to defend Israel by a correct Israeli policy, by recognizing the Palestinians, and they will recognize us.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 10

ISRAEL

[Interjection by unidentified Knesset member from Agudat Yisra'el sitting next to Wilner] There is a Jewish proverb which says: Heavens above, guard me from such friends.

[Begin] Mr Wilner, I congratulate you for having such a neighbor. However, let's go on.

[Wilner] Is there a Palestinian people or is there not? Are we exterminating the other people or are we recognizing them so that they will recognize us. Yes or no. That is the problem of peace.

[Begin] Mr Wilner, I once heard such questions from a Soviet investigating magistrate. However, today I am standing on the podium of Israel, as prime minister of Israel. And you are not in [name indistinct].

[Knesset Speaker Shamir calls on MK Wilner to remain quiet: several indistinct exchanges follow.]

[Begin] Mr Chairman, I wish to make the government's policy at this time quite clear.

[Indistinct interjection by MK Toubi of Hadash]

[Shamir] MK Toubi, I ask you to stop. You will participate in the debate.

[Begin] There is a song, I remember it Mr Tawfiq Toubi. The communists sang it: And we will be judges. You will not. So please sit quietly and let me say my piece. I do not disturb you. It does not impress me. I already sat in the dock in a place which, were you to reach it, you would not live in the Soviet Union.

[Wilner] Maybe there's still time to go there. [general laughter]

[Begin] Not maybe, you would certainly get there. I met people like you in certain places in the Soviet Union. Mr Speaker, I want to get to the end of my remarks and enough of this dispute with the two members of RAKAH.

I want to state the government's policy with respect to the events of the past few days. President as-Sadat, without any justification, and with total surprise, instructed the Egyptian delegation to the Political Committee to return to Cairo immediately. As the U.S. secretary of state informed us, we had made progress in the negotiations toward a new joint declaration of principles. Not the one that had already been agreed upon in Ismailia. We conducted negotiations. We made progress and President as-Sadat stopped it suddenly. With all due respect, there was no justification for this.

Afterward, we were asked to send our delegation, headed by the defense minister, to Cairo yesterday to continue the deliberations of the Military Committee. The government decided to postpone the departure of our delegation. Mr Speaker, when remarks like those I have read are being made in the Egyptian capital, and they are coming out of the abyss [tehom], this is not an atmosphere in which--especially after the cessation of the deliberations in the framework of the Political Committee--the defense minister of the State of Israel, the chief of staff of the State of Israel, staff officers of the Israeli army, can go to Cairo--as if nothing had happened, nothing had happened, no ultimatums unacceptable to us were delivered--to sit down and deliberate.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 11

ISRAEL

However, we explicitly decided and stated that if there is an improvement in the atmosphere and if there are no more attacks against the honor of the Jewish people and the Jewish state--and we have arisen, Mr Speaker, in order to fight for our people and its liberty, but we also exist in order to defend the honor of the Jewish people and we will also fulfill this obligation; we honor the neighboring people, we have written nothing of that nature about the Egyptian people, we respect the Egyptian people, we have respect for the great Arab nation and for its contribution to the culture of mankind; I made these remarks at that banquet to the Egyptian foreign minister as well--but under no circumstances will we allow the honor of the Jewish people to be besmirched. They have arisen with honor and will live with honor. We will defend this honor, for we are created for this, and for this reason we decided as we did.

We have left the door totally open to a renewal of the negotiations--both in the framework of the Military Committee and in the framework of the political deliberations, both with respect to the declaration of principles and with respect to relations between Egypt and Israel. When, during the next few days, we look and see that there are no more attacks there will be no further barrier on the path to prevent the leader of our delegation, the defense minister, and his colleagues from leaving and participating in the deliberations of the Military Committee.

Secondly, Mr Speaker, the settlements--I expressed our views on the settlements in Ismailia. I told President as-Sadat about them. Of course, Defense Minister Ezer Weizman gave me and the government a full and accurate report on his talks with President as-Sadat in Aswan. Of course, Ezer Weizman told us that President as-Sadat expressed opposition to the existence of the settlements between Rafah and Al-'Arish. It is President as-Sadat's right to oppose. I went at the head of the Israeli delegation to Ismailia, and I proposed both parts of our peace plan to him and in one of the clauses of my proposal it was said: Mr President, these settlements will enjoy self-defense because in view of the experience of our generation we will not leave any Jewish settlement without such defense. And I added: We honor your principle; we ask that you honor our principle.

It is true that in Ismailia, as well, President as-Sadat explained to us why he did not accept our position. This is the reason for negotiations. However, did they come to an end in Ismailia because of this Israeli demand? On the contrary, the meeting ended in friendship and understanding with a joint decision that this issue would be deliberated upon and that there would be negotiations, either in the Political or Military Committee. We thought that the Political Committee was the proper place. The Egyptians thought that the Military Committee was the place. This was not important. But there should be negotiations. The remarks made by President as-Sadat at the end of the deliberations at the first meeting were: I understand that you have brought a proposal to us. We will prepare our own proposal and we will discuss them both. I understand that you have difficulties. I have difficulties as well. We will conduct negotiations. These were his remarks. No ultimatum, no demand that we should behave as he wished. Otherwise there would be no negotiations. On the contrary, in the wake of these exchanges, which were most civilized and friendly, we went to a joint press conference, we explained our positions and we decided to continue the negotiations in the two committees in Cairo and in Jerusalem. Therefore, I can say, Mr Speaker, that this point was made absolutely and sincerely clear by the Israeli delegation.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 12

ISRAEL

As for the peace plan prior to arriving in Ismailia, we presented it to the U.S. President and the vice president, to the secretary of state and the adviser for national security affairs, to former U.S. President Gerald Ford, to prominent senators, to the British prime minister and foreign minister. All of them without exception had words of praise for this plan. I will rely only on things that were made public. Remarks were made privately and they shall not be made public today. However, the things that were said publicly are as follows: The U.S. president, Mr Jimmy Carter, said with respect to our peace plan: [begin English] There is a great deal of flexibility [end English]; [Begin translates the English into Hebrew] [begin English] a long step forward; [end English]; [Begin translates English into Hebrew] while the secretary of state said: [begin English] A notable contribution [end English]; [Begin translates the English into Hebrew] to the peace process, of course.

[Interjection by MK Wilner] A notable contribution toward a new war.

[Begin English] And a constructive approach. [end English]; [Begin translates English into Hebrew]

These were the opinions expressed, both in the United States and in the British capital: a positive plan, a good one, a contribution to the peace process. These were the remarks made. This was the assessment of the Israeli peace plan, and it will remain that way.

Speech Said To Be Softened

TA232239Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Text] Prime Minister Begin apparently softened his speech compared with the draft he had prepared. In an English version distributed before the speech, it was said, among other things, regarding the expressions made in Egypt against Israel: these expressions are not only anti-Semitic and slanderous but also a repetition of what we read in [the Nazi paper] DER STURMER at the time. In such an atmosphere of hate and incitement toward hate against the Jewish people and its state, it will be useless and humiliating for our delegation to travel to Cairo and to take part in the talks of the Military Committee.

Further on in the draft it says: I must add a warning that if these expressions are reiterated and if this insulting language is heard again, we will not be able to send Israeli representatives and spokesmen to a place where our people and country are condemned so much. These things were deleted by the prime minister, who substituted more moderate remarks.

Peres Addresses Knesset

TA232135Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1513 GMT 23 Jan 78 TA

[Address by Labor Party leader MK (Shimon Peres) in the Knesset on 23 January--live] *PN 12-17*

[Text] Mr Chairman, honorable Knesset members: I sit at home and ask myself: This debate, is it held because we have, in our hearts, a serious and weighty reason to reply to severe things that have been said and written in Egypt, or is it held because it has an objective more than a cause? The objective is to open as wide as possible the peace gates that were hesitatingly opened and are now open to angry drafts. In the final analysis, I believe that the objective is much more important than the cause. We heard hard things in the past. However, this hope for peace is the one that determines things.

V. 24 Jan 78

N 13

ISRAEL

Despite the fact that we find ourselves in a crisis now, we should reiterate that the desire for peace has not vanished, that the chance for peace is not lost and that this house has remained united behind the wish to turn the desire and chance into a new Middle East reality.

The Alinement, Mr Chairman, will support, both in the future and in the present debate, every effort leading to peace. This I say without disregarding the intolerable setbacks that accompanied these efforts. The entire Jewish people, and I hope all Israeli citizens as well, will not be able to keep quiet about the truly intolerable attacks on the part of the Egyptian press and several Egyptian spokesmen on the Jewish people, its authorized representatives and the prime minister. I have not come across--in our press or in the words of the official representatives of Israel--remarks that constitute an insult toward the Egyptian people, its leaders, and certainly not toward President as-Sadat, who in his visit in Jerusalem gained only appreciation and honor--regardless of the not very simple past that existed between us both in words and in deeds. We did not say what Egyptian spokesmen have said: that Israel--and this is one of the harsh remarks I read in the Egyptian press--used war threats--and I am quoting here--that mention the Nazi words in the wake of Hitler's rise to power. We have not accused anyone of being a Shylock. We have not blamed anyone for pursuing the pound of flesh. We have not called any Egyptian leader arrogant.

President as-Sadat said here that a considerable part of the problems on the way to peace are problems of psychological character and that the psychological bar should be overcome. It seems to me that such talk creates this psychological bar anew.

However, Mr Chairman, when rifts are revealed in negotiations, they should not be handled by loud and insulting charges. A rift is not a tragedy. A rift is a subject to negotiation. The first attack, to my great regret, was made by President as-Sadat in his famous interview to OCTOBER. In this interview As-Sadat claims that Begin has given nothing, and, in contrast, he has given everything. I am quoting him here. As-Sadat can claim that not everything he demanded was given him, but it is impossible to claim that the Israeli proposal to restore Egyptian sovereignty up to the international border, over the entire Sinai, and to have a certain arrangement regarding Judaea and Samaria, is only nothing. It is impossible to describe things in this way. Even a person who criticizes the Israeli plan cannot accept this claim and description.

President as-Sadat says that we have not made any concession since the territories belong to Egypt anyway. However, when he says that he has given us everything, what has in fact given us? Normalization. Is normalization such an abnormal thing? Does not every people deserve to live in normal conditions, without thereby doing each other a favor?

President as-Sadat claimed that he has given us security. I would prefer to say that he has given security, through peace, to the Egyptian people and to the State of Israel, just as Israel has done concerning the two peoples. However, the president cannot claim that he can guarantee this security in the name of Syria--whose planes today are equal in number to the number of Egyptian planes--a state that, together with the Iraqis, is trying to turn the rejectionist front into a front of a military threat.